

Weak and Strong Localization in Low-Dimensional Semiconductor Structures

S.-R. Eric Yang^{1,2} and J. Rammer^{2,3}

¹*Department of Physics, Korea University, Seoul 136-701, Korea*

²*Institute for Microstructural Sciences, National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario,
Canada, K1A 0R6*

³*Department of Theoretical Physics, Umeå University, 901 87 Umeå, Sweden*

(February 6, 2008)

Abstract

The dependence of the localization length on the number of occupied subbands N in low-dimensional semiconductors is investigated. The localization length is shown to be proportional to the number of occupied subbands in quasi-one-dimensional quantum wires while it grows exponentially with N in quasi-two-dimensional systems. Also a weak localization theory is developed for large N with a well-defined small expansion parameter $1/N$. The temperature dependence of the conductivity deduced using this perturbation theory agrees with the experimentally observed dependence.

PACS numbers: 71.55.Jv, 72.15Rn

Typeset using REVTeX

According to the one-parameter scaling theory of localization [1] electrons are localized in strictly one- and two-dimensional (1D and 2D) systems. The applicability of the weak localization theory of transport [2] is thus limited in these systems: it is applicable when the Thouless length, $L_T = \sqrt{D\tau_{in}}$, is shorter than the localization length ξ [3], and when a small expansion parameter exists (D and τ_{in} are the diffusion constant and the inelastic scattering time). Moreover, the expansion parameter of the diagrammatic transport theory $(k_F l)^{1-d}$ [4], where k_F is the Fermi wave vector, is not small for $d=1$, and the localization length is comparable to the mean free path l . Recent advances in nanofabrication have made it possible to create quasi-one and -two dimensional (Q1D and Q2D) systems where several subbands may be occupied. The purpose of the present paper is to examine the range of the applicability of weak localization theory in Q1D and Q2D systems. The dependence of ξ on the number of occupied subbands N determines the validity range of the condition $L_T < \xi$. When several subbands are occupied $(k_F l)^{1-d}$ is no longer the correct expansion parameter and a new small expansion parameter must be found.

We apply Vollhardt and Wölfle's self-consistent diagrammatic theory of Anderson localization [5] to investigate these problems. Vollhardt and Wölfle's localization length for 1D systems is in good agreement with the exact results of Berezinskii [6] and Abrikosov and Ryzhkin [7]. In 2D their theory predicts that particles are always localized, in agreement with the one-parameter scaling theory of Abrahams et al. [1]. We extend their approach to the multisubband cases in the present paper. We find that in Q1D systems the localization length is proportional to N while in Q2D systems it grows exponentially with N . Our Q1D result is in good qualitative agreement with the previous results obtained using different methods [8]. The basic physics behind the dependence of the localization length on N is the intersubband scattering which diminishes coherent backscattering leading to longer localization lengths. We also find that $1/N(k_F l)^{1-d}$ serves as a small expansion parameter in Q1D and Q2D systems. Our Q1D result may provide an explanation for Mani and von Klitzing's experimentally found temperature dependence of the conductivity [9] ($T^{-p/2}$ with $p \sim 2$). Their quantum wire has the number of occupied subbands between 7 and 11, and

therefore, according to our result, the localization length may be larger than the mean free path. So for temperatures where L_T is shorter than ξ the conductivity may be evaluated using usual weak localization theory.

Our interest is in conduction subbands of GaAs/AlGaAs quantum wells and wires and other subbands with similar electronic structures. In Q1D systems only the lowest subband originating from one of the confinement potentials is assumed to be relevant. Both in Q1D and Q2D systems all the relevant subbands are assumed to be parabolic with an effective mass m^* , so each electron state is labeled by a subband index n and a wavenumber k . The level broadening due to the elastic scattering is assumed sufficiently small in comparison with the subband energy separations so that the subbands are well defined. In the presence of an external potential $V_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) = V_{ext} \exp\{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r} - i\omega t\}$ with the wave vector $\mathbf{q}$ parallel the to x -axis, the Fourier transform of the induced density is given by $\delta n(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \chi(\mathbf{q}, \omega) V_{ext}$, where the Q2D and Q1D polarization functions are $\chi(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \int dz dz' \chi(\mathbf{q}, z, z', \omega)$, and $\chi(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \int dy dy' dz dz' \chi(\mathbf{q}, y, y', z, z', \omega)$, respectively. The polarization function can be expressed in terms of the generalized diffusion coefficient $D(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ [10]

$$\chi(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = N_F \frac{D(\mathbf{q}, \omega) q^2}{-i\omega + D(\mathbf{q}, \omega) q^2} \quad (1)$$

where N_F is the *total* d -dimensional density of states per spin at the Fermi energy. We use δ -function impurity potentials $V_{imp} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'_i)$, where $\mathbf{r}'_i$ are the positions of the impurities. In our model, where many subbands are occupied, the Fermi energy level broadening is assumed to be given by $\gamma = \pi N_F U_0$ with U_0 equal to $n_i |V_{imp}|^2$ (n_i is the impurity concentration).

We calculate corrections to the diffusion constant by including the weak localization effects [11,12]. We include not only the intrasubband, but also the intersubband scattering. As long as the Thouless length is shorter than the localization length the correction to the conductivity due to weak localization effects is determined by summing the maximally crossed diagrams [13]. Green's functions are specified in the subband and momentum representation by respective set of quantum numbers. We have for the Cooperon

$$\Lambda_{m,n;m',n'}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}', \omega) = \Lambda_{m,n;m',n'}^0$$

$$+ \sum_{l,l'} \Lambda_{m,n;l,l'}^0 \Pi_{l,l'}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}', \omega) \Lambda_{l,l';m',n'}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}', \omega) \quad (2)$$

where

$$\Pi_{n,n'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} G_n^R(\epsilon + \omega, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}) G_{n'}^A(\epsilon, \mathbf{k}) \quad (3)$$

Here $G_n^R(\epsilon, \mathbf{k}) = (\epsilon - \epsilon_{n,\mathbf{k}} + i/2\tau)^{-1}$ and the lifetime in each subband, $\tau = 1/2\gamma$, is approximated to be independent of the subband index. The subband dispersion is $\epsilon_{n,\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon_n + \mathbf{k}^2/2m$ where ϵ_n is the n 'th subband energy, and $\Lambda_{m,n;l,l'}^0$ are the matrix elements of the impurity correlator U_0 .

The matrix equation Eq.(2) may be solved for $\Lambda_{m,n;m',n'}$ perturbatively in the small frequency, long wave length limit [14]. The matrix elements of the perturbation are

$$V_{m,n;m',n'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \Lambda_{m,n;m',n'}^0 (\Pi_{n,n'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) - \Pi_{n,n'}(\mathbf{0}, 0)) \quad (4)$$

and the unperturbed eigenstates satisfy

$$\sum_{l,l'} \Lambda_{m,m;l,l'}^0 \Pi_{l,l'}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \Phi_{l,l'}^\alpha = \lambda_\alpha \Phi_{m,m'}^\alpha \quad \alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (5)$$

where

$$\Pi_{n,n'}(\mathbf{0}, 0) = \frac{2\pi i N_{n'} F}{\epsilon_{n'} - \epsilon_n + i/\tau} \quad (6)$$

A perturbation calculation yields $\Lambda_{m,m';n,n'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \approx \Phi_{m,m'}^0 \Phi_{n,n'}^0 / \Delta \lambda_0$ where the change in the eigenvalue λ_0 is given by

$$\Delta \lambda_0 = \langle \Phi^0 | V | \Phi^0 \rangle = \sum_{n,n'} \Phi_{n,n'}^0 \Pi_{n,n'}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \left(\sum_{m,m'} V_{n,n';m,m'}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}', \omega) \Phi_{m,m'}^0 \right) \quad (7)$$

Inserting Eq.(4) and Eq.(6) into Eq.(7) we find

$$\Lambda_{m,n;m',n'}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}', \omega) = \frac{-2\gamma \Phi_{m,n}^0 \Phi_{m',n'}^0}{-i\omega + D_{eff}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}')^2} \approx \frac{-2\gamma^2 / \pi N_F}{-i\omega + D_0(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}')^2} \quad (8)$$

where the effective diffusion constant D_{eff} is evaluated approximately as follows: Using $\Lambda_{m,m;l,l}^0 = \gamma / \pi N_F$ and replacing $\Pi_{n,n}(\mathbf{0}, 0)$ with the average value $\langle \Pi_{n,n}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \rangle \equiv \pi < N_{n,F} > / \gamma \approx \pi N_F / N \gamma$, we find the eigenvector $[\Phi_{n,n}^0]^2 = \gamma / \pi N_F$. Again neglecting the

off-diagonal elements of $\Pi_{n,n'}(\mathbf{0}, 0)$ we find an approximate value for the effective diffusion constant $D_{eff} \approx D_O = \sum_n' D_n/N \approx < v_F >^2 \tau/d$, where the prime indicate that we only sum over occupied subbands and $< v_F >$ is the average subband velocity on the Fermi surface. In our approximation each occupied subband has the same Cooperon and contribute to the conductivity independently. The weak localization correction leads then to a conductivity per spin of a Q1D system

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 + \delta\sigma = \frac{< n > N e^2 \tau}{m} - \frac{e^2}{\hbar \pi} (L - l) = \sigma_0 [1 - \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{L}{l} - 1 \right)] \quad (9)$$

The average density per subband $< n >$ is $< k_F > / \pi$. From Eq.(9) we see that the correction due to weak localization effects is of order $1/N$. When several subbands are occupied in Q1D and Q2D systems $1/N(k_F \ell)^{d-1}$ serves as the small expansion parameter.

We now proceed to derive a formally exact expression for the inverse diffusion constant. We will then find an approximate expression for the inverse diffusion constant by replacing the irreducible vertex by the lowest order expression. The resulting equation is then extended into the insulator regime by demanding self-consistency. Our derivation is an extension of Vollhardt and Wölfle's method to QD systems.

The impurity average of the product of Green's functions $G_{m\mathbf{k}+}^R G_{m'\mathbf{k}'+}^A$ may be expressed as

$$\Phi_{m,n,\mathbf{k};m',n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = G_{m\mathbf{k}+}^R G_{n\mathbf{k}-}^A \delta_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \delta_{n,n'} \delta_{m,m'} + G_{m\mathbf{k}+}^R G_{n\mathbf{k}-}^A \Gamma_{m,n,\mathbf{k};m',n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) G_{m'\mathbf{k}'+}^R G_{n'\mathbf{k}'-}^A \quad (10)$$

The vertex function $\Gamma_{m,n,\mathbf{k};m',n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ is given in terms of the irreducible vertex function $U_{m,n,\mathbf{k};m',n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{m,n,\mathbf{k};m',n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) &= U_{m,n,\mathbf{k};m',n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \\ &+ \sum_{m'',n'',\mathbf{k}''} U_{m,n,\mathbf{k};m'',n'',\mathbf{k}''}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) G_{m''\mathbf{k}''+}^R G_{n''\mathbf{k}''-}^A \Gamma_{m'',n'',\mathbf{k}'';m',n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Using Eq.(11) Φ may be written in terms of the irreducible vertex function

$$\Phi_{n,\mathbf{k};n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = G_{n\mathbf{k}+}^R G_{n\mathbf{k}-}^A \delta_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \delta_{n,n'} + G_{n\mathbf{k}+}^R G_{n\mathbf{k}-}^A \sum_{n'',\mathbf{k}''} U_{n,\mathbf{k};n'',\mathbf{k}''}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \Phi_{n'',\mathbf{k}'';n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \quad (12)$$

Using

$$G_{n\mathbf{k}+}^R G_{n\mathbf{k}-}^A = \frac{\Delta G_{n,\mathbf{k}}}{\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{q} - \Delta \Sigma_{n,\mathbf{k}}} \quad (13)$$

we rewrite Eq.(12)

$$\begin{aligned} (\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{q} - \Delta \Sigma_{n,\mathbf{k}}) \Phi_{n,\mathbf{k};n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = & -\Delta G_{n,\mathbf{k}} \left(\delta_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \delta_{n,n'} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{n'',\mathbf{k}''} U_{n,\mathbf{k};n'',\mathbf{k}''}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \Phi_{n'',\mathbf{k}'';n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Summing over $n, \mathbf{k}; n', \mathbf{k}'$ in Eq.(14), and using $\Delta G_{n,\mathbf{k}} = 2i\Im m G_{n,\mathbf{k}}$, and the Ward identity

$$\Delta \Sigma_{n,\mathbf{k}} = \sum_{n',\mathbf{k}'} U_{n,\mathbf{k};n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \Delta G_{n',\mathbf{k}'} \quad (15)$$

we find

$$\omega \Phi(\mathbf{q}, \omega) - q \Phi_j(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = 2\pi i N_F \quad (16)$$

where $\Phi(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \sum_{n,\mathbf{k};n',\mathbf{k}'} \Phi_{n,\mathbf{k};n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ and $\Phi_j(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \sum_{n,\mathbf{k};n',\mathbf{k}'} \frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}}}{m^*} \Phi_{n,\mathbf{k};n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$.

Multiplying Eq.(14) with $\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}}/k_{nF}$, where k_{nF} is the n 'th subband Fermi wave vector, and summing over $n, \mathbf{k}; n', \mathbf{k}'$ we find when $\gamma \gg \omega$

$$K(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \Phi_j(\mathbf{q}, \omega) + iq D_0 \Phi(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = 0 \quad (17)$$

where

$$K(\omega, \mathbf{q}) = 1 + \tau \sum_{n,\mathbf{k};n',\mathbf{k}'} \frac{d}{\pi k_{nF}^2 N_{nF} N} \mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}} \Delta G_{n,\mathbf{k}} (U_{n,n;n',n'}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}', \omega) - U_0) \Delta G_{n',\mathbf{k}'} \mathbf{k}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}} \quad (18)$$

In deriving Eq.(17) we have used the approximation $\Delta \Sigma_{n,\mathbf{k}} = \Sigma_{n,\mathbf{k}}^R(E_F + \omega) - \Sigma_{n,\mathbf{k}}^A(E_F) \approx 2i\Im m \Sigma_{n,\mathbf{k}}^R(E_F) = 2i\gamma$, as $\omega \ll E_F$. In addition we have used the peaked character of the spectral function to approximate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n',\mathbf{k}'} \Phi_{n,\mathbf{k};n',\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \approx & \frac{\Delta G_{n,\mathbf{k}}}{-2\pi i N_{nF} N} \left(\sum_{n',\mathbf{k}';n'',\mathbf{k}''} \Phi_{n',\mathbf{k}';n'',\mathbf{k}''}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{d\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}}}{k_{nF}} \sum_{n',\mathbf{k}'} \frac{\mathbf{k}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}}}{k'_{nF}} \sum_{n'',\mathbf{k}''} \Phi_{n',\mathbf{k}';n'',\mathbf{k}''}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

keeping the first two terms in the Legendre expansion. Here we note that $\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}} = k_{nF} P_l(\cos \theta)$, where θ is the angle between $\mathbf{k}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$.

Using the general form of the response kernel [5] and approximating $U_{n,n;n,n} - U_0$ by $\Lambda_{n,n;n,n}$ we find

$$\frac{D_0}{D(\mathbf{q}, \omega)} = 1 + \frac{1}{\pi N_F} \sum_{\mathbf{Q}} \frac{1}{-i\omega + D_0 \mathbf{Q}^2} \quad (20)$$

The residue of $\Lambda_{n,n;n,n}$ at $i\omega = D_0 q^2$ is $2\gamma/\pi N_F$ and is about $1/N$ times smaller than the value for the case where only one subband is occupied. This will have important consequences for the subband dependence of the localization length. Invoking self-consistency and multiplying Eq.(20) with $D(\omega)/D_0$ we find

$$\frac{D(\omega)}{D_0} = 1 - \frac{1}{\pi N_F D_0} \sum_{\mathbf{Q}} \frac{1}{-i\omega/D(\omega) + \mathbf{Q}^2} \quad (21)$$

This result determines the dependence of the localization length on the number of occupied subbands. By setting the upper Q -integration limit in Eq.(21) to $1/l$ and introducing a new variable $y = \sqrt{D(\omega)/-i\omega Q}$ we find

$$\frac{D(\omega)}{D_0} = 1 - \frac{2\pi^{d-1} l^{2-d}}{\pi N_F D_0 (2\pi)^d} \tilde{\xi}^{2-d} \int_0^{\tilde{\xi}} dy \frac{y^{d-1}}{1+y^2} \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{\xi} = \sqrt{D(\omega)/-i\omega l^2} = \xi/l$. In the insulating regime the generalized diffusion constant approaches zero as ω approaches zero [15], and we find for Q1D and Q2D systems $\tilde{\xi} \tan^{-1} \tilde{\xi} = N\pi$ and $\xi = l \left(e^{N/\lambda} - 1 \right)^{1/2}$ where $\lambda = 1/2\pi E_F \tau$. For large N , we thus have $\xi = 2Nl$ for Q1D systems. When $N = 1$ and $E_F \gg \tau$ both results for Q1D and Q2D agree well with the perturbative estimates of ξ in 1D and 2D systems, namely πl and $l e^{\pi k_F l/2}$. We thus predict for quasi-dimensional systems a cross-over from the strongly localized to the weakly localized regime as the number of occupied subbands increases. The fact that the residue of $\Lambda_{n,n;n,n}$ is $1/N$ times smaller than that of singly occupied subbands is responsible for this effect. It is simple to show that the scaling functions β of Q1D and Q2D systems are not changed from the corresponding 1D and 2D values.

For sufficiently large N the condition $L_T < \xi$ can be fulfilled and weak localization theory may be used to calculate the conductivity. We find in Q1D systems that $\delta\sigma \sim T^{-1}$. The

effect of Coulomb interactions in the presence of weak localization effects in 1D and 2D systems has been investigated by Al'tshuler et al [16]. In Q1D and Q2D systems the same diagrams of Al'tshuler et al may be used when the Cooperon is replaced by our expression. The temperature dependence of these corrections is $T^{-1/2}$ in Q1D systems. The temperature exponents found above, -1 and -1/2, are in agreement with the recent experimental values [9]. Mani and von Klitzing observed that the magnetoresistance of GaAs/AlGaAs quantum wires exhibits T^{-1} and $T^{-1/2}$ behavior above 1.5 K, and at temperatures below 1.5 K the observed magnetoresistance saturates, as expected from the effect of electron localization. The number of occupied subbands in one of the wires used in the experiment is estimated to be between 7 and 11 [17]. We believe that this large number for the occupied subbands is responsible for the observed temperature exponents.

This work was supported by Korea University through a start-up grant and by NON DIRECTED RESEARCH FUND, Korea Research Foundation. Also we acknowledge the support by the Swedish Natural Research Council through contract F-AA/FU 10199 – 306.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Abrahams, P.W. Anderson, D.C. Licciardello, and T.V. Ramakrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 673 (1979).
- [2] For a general review see, for example, P.A.Lee, and T.V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, 287 (1985).
- [3] D. J. Thouless, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39**, 1167 (1977).
- [4] A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gorkov, I. E. Dzhyaloshinskii, Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics (Prentice-Hall, England Cliff, N.J.)
- [5] D. Vollhardt and P. Wölfle, in "Electronic Phase Transitions", edited by W. Hanke and Y.V. Kopaev, Elsevier, 1992.
- [6] V. L. Berezinskii Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **65**, 1251(1974) [Sov. Phys.-JETP **38**, 620 (1974)].
- [7] A. A. Abrikosov and I.A. Ryzhkin, Adv. Phys. **27**, 147 (1978).
- [8] O.N. Dorokhov, Sov. Phys. JETP **58**, 606 (1983); K.B. Efetov and A.I. Larkin, Sov. Phys. JETP **58**, 444 (1983); J. L. Pichard et al, Phys. Rev. Lett.**65**, 1812 (1990); H.Tamura and T. Ando, Phys. Rev. **B44**, 1792(1991).
- [9] R.G. Mani, K. von Klitzing and K. Ploog, Phys. Rev. **B48**, 4571 (1993).
- [10] D. Forster,"Hydrodynamic Fluctuations, Broken Symmetry and Correlation functions(Benjamin/Cummings, Reading 1975).
- [11] A. I. Larkin and D. E. Khmel'nitskii, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **136** 536 (1982)[Sov. Phys. Usp. **25**, 185 (1982)].
- [12] For a review see G. Bergmann, Phys. Rep. **107**, 1 (1984).
- [13] J. S. Langer and T. Neal, Phys. Rev. Lett.**16**, 984 (1966).
- [14] P. Wölfle and R.N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. **B30**, 3542 (1984).

- [15] W. Götze, Solid State Commun. **27**, 1393 (1978).
- [16] Al'tshuler, B.L., D.E. Khmel'nitskii, A.I. Larkin, and P.A. Lee, 1980, Phys. Rev. **B22**, 5142.
- [17] R.G. Mani and K. von Klitzing, Phys. Rev. **B46**, 9877 (1992).